

**Governor's Upper Yellowstone River Task Force**  
**Meeting Summary**  
**August 20, 2002**  
**Yellowstone Inn**  
**Meeting began at 7:00 pm**

**I. Introduction**

**Members Present:**

John Bailey, Chair  
 Roy Aserlind  
 Andy Dana  
 Doug Ensign

Michelle Goodwine  
 Jerry O'Hair  
 Brant Oswald  
 Rod Siring

Ellen Woodbury  
 Jim Woodhull

Terri Marceron, USFS Ex-Officio  
 Tom Olliff, YNP Ex-Officio  
 Robert Ray, DEQ Ex-Officio

Laurence Siroky, DNRC Ex-Officio  
 Allan Steinle, Corps Ex-Officio

**Others Present:**

Liz Galli-Noble, Coordinator  
 Duncan Patten, TAC Chair  
 Bethany Rivard, Secretary

Lionel Dicharry  
 Jeanne Marie Souvigney  
 Bill Moser  
 Karl Biastoch

Dick Baerman  
 Peter Ismert  
 Rodney Schwartz  
 John Esp

**II. Prior Meeting Minutes**

**Jerry O'Hair moved to approve the July 23, 2002 minutes. Ellen Woodbury seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

**III. Financial Updates**

**1. Grant Spending Report:**

Liz Galli-Noble reported the following financial updates to the Task Force:

<b>EXPENDED GRANTS</b>			
<b>Grant Name</b>	<b>Completed</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Study Component</b>
DNRC Watershed Planning Assistance Grant	6/30/99	2,100.00	Physical Features Inventory
DNRC HB223 Grant	7/30/99	10,000.00	Aerial photography
DNRC Riparian/Wetlands Educational Grant	6/30/00	960.99	<i>Hydrologic Response to the 1988 Fires Workshop</i>
DEQ 319 Grant (1 <sup>st</sup> )	9/30/00	40,000.00	Coordinator position
DNRC Watershed Planning Assistance Grant	1/31/01	10,000.00	Watershed Land Use Study
DEQ Start-Up Grant	6/26/01	49,138.00	Coordinator position, Admin Secretary, additional cross-sections, operating expenses.
DNRC HB223	10/1/01	6,500.00	Riparian Trend Analysis
BLM Funding	10/26/01	10,000.00	Wildlife Study
DEQ 319 Grant – 2 <sup>nd</sup>	3/21/02	58,000.00	Coordinator position
<b>CURRENT GRANTS</b>			
<b>Grant Name</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Spent</b>	<b>Remaining Balance</b>
DNRC RDGP Grant (expires 12/31/02)	299,940.00	254,409.37	45,530.63
DEQ 319 Grant (3 <sup>rd</sup> ) (expires 6/20/03)	44,000.00	19,687.16	24,312.84
DEQ 319 Grant (4 <sup>th</sup> ) (expires 3/30/04)	122,200.00	0	122,200.00

	30,000.00	21,580.00	8,420.00
--	-----------	-----------	----------

#### IV. Decision Making Processes / Formulating Management Recommendations

##### 1. Task Force Presentation Process

The Task Force reviewed *Attachment A* and commented as follows:

**John Bailey:** The first thing we need to review is the *Task Force Consensus Decision-Making Process* handout—Steps 1 through 4, which were discussed at our last Task Force meeting. This really isn't the "consensus" part of our process, rather it's how we're going to present the scientific (the scientific findings).

**Liz Galli-Noble:** I guess we shouldn't use the word "consensus" in the title, maybe it should read the process to move through the presentations. I'll rename it the "Task Force Presentation Process".

I also want to point out that I was asked by Task Force members to add a few things to this handout and I just want to make sure everyone is in agreement with what was added. Added items are:

II. 1. "The Task Force chair would give a reminder of the presentation format."

Duncan would split this process with John Bailey and "address how the individual study fits within the comprehensive or integrated project design".

I heard people saying that they wanted some kind of an introduction to get us all on the same page; that is, what are the meeting rules, who speaks first, who leads the discussion, etc. It might be a good idea when studies start building on each other, for Duncan to say a few words about how a particular presentation may integrate into something we've already seen, like the geomorphology and how it's building on the hydraulic study. Just a brief, five-minute introduction from the TAC Chair.

**John Bailey:** It says, "Task Force chair, reminder of presentation format and full decision making process." From the last meeting, I don't think we have a full decision making process in place yet.

**Liz Galli-Noble:** We would strike it if we didn't come to some consensus on the full decision making process. When I took this idea from our readings, it was stressed that the chair would remind everyone at the meeting that this is part of an overall process; a process that we've all agreed upon. Again to remind people what those steps and rules are. The reminder would only take a couple of minutes. We certainly don't have to leave it in; we should just start the meetings reminding everyone what they've agreed to do.

**Robert Ray:** Is that specifically related to the presentation portion of the process?

**Liz Galli-Noble:** What I understood from the readings is that the chair would address both. The reminder is supposed to cover the presentation format and the full decision making process, to remind people that there will be an additional process that will follow this one, and that recommendations will be formulated. It was supposed to be an overview of the full process, so that everyone understands what will happen immediately and in the future, with regard to the scientific findings being presented.

**John Bailey:** Well we've looked at two and three, and we didn't take the bottom part of that page.

**Andy Dana:** Can we strike the "full decision making process and the purposes of the Task Force"?

**Liz Galli-Noble:** The wording is from page 7 of the July 23, 2002 meeting minutes in front of you (Handout #2 Example #1). I just copied this verbatim out of the example. The point of this is you don't want to just give a very short description of what you're doing. Instead, you want to remind everyone of the full process that they've bought into. And that would not be just the presentation of the science; it would also be making recommendations. We want people to have the full picture.

**John Bailey:** We have a process for going through the scientific studies.

**Liz Galli-Noble:** Should I put the phrase into parenthesis? That way if we do decide to do this we can leave it, if we don't decide to do a full decision-making process, we can strike it.

**John Bailey:** Any other discussion on steps #1? #2?

**Roy Aserlind:** It was my understanding of the original discussion that they would entertain questions from the general audience.

**John Bailey:** Once the formal presentation is over and we go through the standard set questions, then we were going to let Task Force members ask questions, and then the public may ask questions. Now that this is in front of us again, are we saying that questions could be asked up here, during the presentation?

**Liz Galli-Noble:** I was asked to add the 3a standardized question language as a possible Task Force action. It is italicize because it's a new concept and we're going to discuss the issue tonight. It was my understanding that it would be the Task Force chair who would be asking the set of standardized questions, but was not 100 percent sure about that.

**John Bailey:** That has gone to the subcommittee for their recommendation.

**Duncan Patten:** I'm assuming Liz, that the researchers will be given the questions beforehand. This is not an oral exam.

**Terri Marceron:** I was a member of the Standardized Questions Subcommittee, and I think the only reason we had that option (that is to have the chair ask these specific questions) was to make sure that someone didn't miss it in the presentation. What we wanted was to make sure that things went in some sort of sequence, because you can go through the presentation and forget something. All we were doing is asking that one person would keep track, so that the questions could be checked off.

**Andy Dana:** If the researchers do get these questions in advance, do we want them to reply with written responses? Otherwise, I could see that researchers would think they answered the questions in the context of a presentation and we could be going over this again and again.

**John Bailey:** I think that we're going to have to go back to this. I don't know what the subcommittee has recommended, whether they said written or oral. We're going to have to have a discussion and resolution as to what we're going to do, and then we're going to have to plug it in.

**Andy Dana:** I want to go back to #3b. I don't understand how we're going to determine whether a question is seeking greater comprehension, and how the Task Force chair makes sure that everyone comprehends the information.

**Liz Galli-Noble:** The readings say that the chair should actually ask: Do people understand what's being presented? Are people confident that they have a good grasp on what was just presented? Can we move on to full discussion? The real gist of this is that there's a presentation, a time for questions, and then you move into concerns, issues and discussion. You don't want to meld those things, because you may have people starting to ask questions and quickly it moves into value statements and concerns, and you never really get to a point where people are comfortable with what is presented. To answer the other question concerning how to keep questions strictly limited to greater comprehension. What that meant to say, is that if someone started to go into concerns, issues, values, and there isn't a real question being asked (they're actually stating their opinions on things) they should be told to hold that thought until the next session, which is broad and open discussion. The questions session is supposed to be highly structured so that you have more control and can move through more material in a limited period of time.

**Andy Dana:** I was talking about small #3b. If the Task Force chair is comfortable with making sure that everyone comprehends the information presented, that's fine with me.

**Brant Oswald:** You determine that by asking, correct?

**Liz Galli-Noble:** Yes, the chair asks: Are we ready to move on, do you have any more questions? If someone chooses not to ask questions, or not to respond to the chair's question; that is an action, that is a decision.

**Andy Dana:** I'm just thinking, I could sit through a presentation on nuclear physics, and someone could ask me if I fully comprehend it, and I say, "sure". I could have no idea what they're talking about. I think we should move on if everybody else does.

**John Bailey:** Are we going to let the Task Force ask questions first and then the public? My concern is that we have a formal way to go about this, so that it's clear to everyone from the start. If we want to let anybody speak at any time, that's fine with me. If I have to be the referee, I want to know what you want me to do.

**Liz Galli-Noble:** So, may I ask for a point of clarification? The question was asked, under #3b if we should repeat the same phrase that's in #4b. Should it simply repeat the same phrase but under the question section, concerning asking questions of course?

**John Bailey:** Isn't the real question, "fully comprehends the information"?

**Andy Dana:** I would move #3b to make it #2a, and change it to, "additional questions are strictly limited to seeking clarification about factual or methodological issues".

**John Bailey:** I think that's clear to me.

**Liz Galli-Noble:** So, that was moving #3b to #2a, is that correct?

**Andy Dana:** Yes.

**Robert Ray:** So, are you suggesting that there might be two sets of questions? One factual and the next contextual?

**Andy Dana:** I was thinking more in terms of what methodology was used. To really focus on what facts the study found, and how it was conducted.

**Duncan Patten:** John, I'd like to say something. I think you're making a mountain out of a molehill. I think we're asking the researchers to come in; they introduce the hypothesis and purpose of their study, give the methods, give the findings, and give the interpretations. You then open it up to questions from the Task Force, and then the audience. Period.

**John Bailey:** I thought what we were doing last time was, they present, and then the Task Force asks questions, and then the public. Then we could go into a general session.

**Duncan Patten:** It should be a simple process. These people have given presentations on their data everywhere, and if there's something unclear, then you ask. If you want something expanded, you ask them to expand. It's pretty straightforward.

**Andy Dana:** It's straightforward if it's not controversial. The whole reason for this process is to discourage controversy, or members of the general public that might get up and grandstand. So, it's not necessarily going to be that easy.

**Duncan Patten:** That's the chair's role, to cool that.

**Andy Dana:** This structured process gives the chair a tool to do that.

**Duncan Patten:** The audience will not have a chance to speak until the Task Force does. If something is controversial, that should have been taken care when we approved the research.

**Andy Dana:** The public didn't approve the research.

**Duncan Patten:** Are we going to tell the public that they can't ask certain questions?

**Andy Dana:** I'm in favor of a process. With respect, I think we do need it in case we get meetings that spin out of control. This gives us a framework.

**John Bailey:** What was the last wording we had under #3b?

**Andy Dana:** Looking at this more carefully, maybe we can just dispense with #3b entirely. Because questions held until the end of the presentation unless they are brief clarification-type questions about factual or methodological issues.

**John Bailey:** And then can we have #3b where Task Force members will ask questions first and then the public? The research is in and then we might have a discussion about what it means overall.

**Ellen Woodbury:** So, you're saying strike what's there under #3b and move that to #4b?

**John Bailey:** I think a more formal structure where people know when they're going to speak, and the Task Force has to have a chance to air their issues first. We certainly don't want to block the public out. Does anyone have anything to say under general discussion?

**Liz Galli-Noble:** I want to make sure that I have captured what you want for the Questions Section. So 3a is still "asking standardized questions", which we will deal with in a minute. 3b is the language repeated under #4b, just specifically talking about questions, not comments. Do we want to retain what is now 3c, where the chair asks the group if they're comfortable? I want to push this just a little bit because I think it's needed. If you want a process, the chair has to go through this step; that is, making sure that the group is comfortable moving on. Does anyone have an issue with a formal declaration from the chair to move on to the next session? I'll just write it in normal English.

**John Bailey:** Anything under #4 General Discussion Session?

**Andy Dana:** I guess I'd suggest moving 4a to the end of the introduction. And then bump it down and have the process laid out. Task Force goes first, then members of the public, and then determine if there's a need for more information.

**John Bailey:** One of the things we talked about a lot is that we may want to revisit these issues at another meeting. It almost sounds like we're done here.

**Duncan Patten:** Some of the questions will have to do with integration. There's no question that some of these issues will bring together other issues of integration. The hope is that the interrelationship between these projects will continue to be brought forward. This isn't going to be dropped at the end of one session.

**John Bailey:** I'm wondering if I should ask if people want to continue this discussion at another meeting. It seems like a formal step.

**Liz Galli-Noble:** I have another comment: I thought that 4c—which is now going to be 4b, because we've dropped 4a—would give you the platform to say, "The Task Force still has questions concerning this study", "can the research team go back and see if you can answer these questions in a different way? Re-examine your findings to better address a specific question". I would hope that the Task Force will be comfortable with the data at the conclusion of the presentations, and that you will understand what has been presented to you. There shouldn't be a lot of issues or questions still remaining at

this point. If there are however, you would clearly state them at this point in the process, and the research team would come back and address them.

**John Bailey:** I read this, and I get the sense that when we leave the meeting that night, it's over. Shouldn't there be opportunities for further discussion?

**Jim Woodhull:** Part of the problem is that we don't have a formal decision-making process yet.

**John Bailey:** When we make it so clear on the questions above, I'm wondering if the Task Force wants clarity on this closure subject. We've got our general discussion coming to some conclusions. We all know some of those issues are going to come back. Liz made a point above, which I don't disagree with, but it looks like it's hanging. Someone's probably going to ask a question related to data from some other study, and eventually we have to take them all together. No one seems to want to address this right now, so we can move on.

**Terri Marceron:** I thought at the last meeting we discussed that these were the individual scientific presentations, and at the end of the presentations we talked about having a group panel, a roundtable. The individual scientific presentations may be able to capture some questions or comments; and at the end we would have a group roundup, where all of the researchers would come and we'd try a discussion interchangeably with everybody.

**Duncan Patten:** If I'm understanding, after the Task Force hears each individual team you would then like to have a roundtable with all of the researchers. I'd like to add one thing: I'd like a note stating that these presentations are scientific presentations and as the TAC chair I will defend the scientists if it gets out of hand. I do not want false accusations directed at the presenters, like what happened at our 2001 spring workshop.

**John Bailey:** Any more discussion on this?

**Andy Dana:** I appreciate what Duncan is saying, and I think that he has every right to be outraged in that situation. But I'm not convinced that he is the right person to do that. I think it should be John Bailey, or the Task Force members themselves.

**Robert Ray:** I think that's what he was asking for, some protection from the Task Force chair.

**Duncan Patten:** It would be ideal if the Task Force chair plays that role, but if that does not happen, I will say that somebody's out of order. The sideboards of these presentations are science, and if we go outside those sideboards and get into values, hopefully John will come in and say, "You're out of line". I'm introducing these people and their projects, and therefore I play somewhat of a role in terms of the science.

**Andy Dana:** But the TAC and all of the scientific studies have been commissioned by the Task Force. And the TAC is advisory for the Task Force, so I think we need to discuss as a Task Force whether we want the chair of our advisory committee to do that or not.

**Duncan Patten:** I agree with you.

**John Bailey:** Do you want to add that to this list, or is it a separate subject we need to bring up?

**Andy Dana:** I think it's probably a separate subject.

No formal decision was made concerning the facilitation issue.

**Liz Galli-Noble:** If we are done with the previous issue, I want to draw your attention to 4d. You went back and forth on this issue at the July meeting, and basically said "no". But right after that meeting three people said, What if we do get immediate agreement on an issue and there's a recommendation. What do we do then? So I just drafted some language to

that effect in 4d; if you don't like it, we can simply strike it. You need the process to address potential situations that could occur.

**Roy Aserlind:** I feel that no recommendation should be made at this time in the process. We're talking about individual presentations, and in essence what we're dealing with is a whole collection. Subsequent presentations may have a bearing on what we decide.

**Liz Galli-Noble:** If you read this language, it states that a recommendation could be modified, rejected, or endorsed in the future. This is going to be a huge process, and my fear is that things/ideas are going to get lost in the shuffle. We talk about issues addressed in our minutes from two meetings ago, and people can't remember what we said, can you imagine us going through this much information and trying to recall major ideas that were brought up. If you don't want it, we won't do it.

**Jerry O'Hair:** I really don't want a snap decision that affects a bunch of people.

**Andy Dana:** These are only draft recommendations.

**Michelle Goodwine:** I like the idea of compiling thoughts like that.

**John Bailey:** I think we make a mistake by not putting something down on paper. They could be recommendations, or topics for consideration. If we don't capture what people are thinking, when we get to the big picture, we're really going to be lost.

**Robert Ray:** Maybe it's a little bit loaded to call them draft recommendations. Issues, comments, and concerns are going to be recorded, that's part of the function of this group. Hopefully that information would be sifted through and looked at or listed.

**Liz Galli-Noble:** And that's actually the problem. So, when are we going to do that? How are we going to do that? And when are those decisions going to be made? We have seven major presentations, and at the end of it we have to integrate and synthesize all that information.

**Michelle Goodwine:** I like the idea of doing it as we go along, so that it's still fresh in our minds.

**John Bailey:** Maybe we ought to make recommendations. It will be interesting for whoever made them to defend them throughout the rest of the process. Some studies should have some fairly clear findings. I think it scares everybody because their recommendations may follow clear to the end. I envision the recommendations all changing radically as we move through this.

**Roy Aserlind:** As part of the process, the researcher makes their presentation followed by discussion and comments. Then will there be some Task Force member that says, "I'll make a recommendation". How about members of the public making recommendations?

**John Bailey:** If we say they can't, then they can't. Everything I've heard so far indicates that people have recommended "no".

Should we call these "issues or comments" rather than "draft recommendations"?

**Terri Marceron:** We're here to make recommendations. I wouldn't get into semantics. People need to get their recommendations on the table, early on. I'd leave that word in there, they're draft.

**Jim Woodhull:** Are these draft recommendations subject to consensus?

**John Bailey:** Everything is.

**Jim Woodhull:** We should be able to freely offer recommendations to note, so that we don't lose them.

**John Bailey:** Everything is going to be recorded. Have you looked at the minutes recently? We will take all of the issues brought up and list them; because when we finally come back to certain topics, we will have a record of all those issues at a minimum.

**Rod Siring:** I think before we start dealing with the consensus process, we should hear all the research. We do need to note things and write them down, but to come to consensus at each meeting might be fruitless.

**John Bailey:** If I were not the chair, I would move that we do make recommendations, because I think the discussion would be invaluable. But as the chair, I can't make a motion. When someone makes a recommendation, they're going to have to defend it and get consensus. Unless something is very clear in the science, there will be no recommendations made after only one presentation.

**Roy Aserlind:** Would these draft recommendations have to go through the consensus process? Or could it be an individual on the Task Force saying, "I'll recommend this".

**John Bailey:** Basic comments will be recorded and documented in your notebook. We're talking about actual recommendations that might make it all the way to the end.

**Karl Biastoch:** Someone could come in and say, "I'd like to open up discussion on this recommendation".

**John Bailey:** I don't know if I would allow that from the public three meetings later. Once we get a hierarchy of recommendations, some may be modified or may not fit anymore. If we come to consensus on a particular recommendation, it illustrates that that was an important issue for everyone. Here's a way to get focused.

**Michelle Goodwine:** If we're going to have minutes that are 20 pages long, and have to sift through it to find those comments, it may not work. I don't have time to do that.

**John Bailey:** We're going to take the comments, line them out, and put them on a sheet of paper. Those summaries can then be put into a notebook for each Task Force member.

**Michelle Goodwine:** I can envision at least four or five pages of comments per presentation. If something important can surface (be highlighted/organized), we can then focus on those items, and it would allow us not have to go back through all the comments.

**Michelle Goodwine moved to accept item 4d: *If any "draft" recommendations surface at this point, they will be clearly documented. When applicable, these "draft" recommendations will be revisited by the Task Force, at which point they may be rejected, modified, or endorsed as "final" recommendations.***

**Roy Aserlind seconded the motion.**

**Andy Dana moved to amend the motion by striking the words "when applicable". The amendment was seconded by Michelle Goodwine. The motion passed unanimously.**

John Bailey then reminded the group that they needed to return to item 3a in the process and address the issue of standardized questions. He asked the members of the subcommittee to brief the Task Force on their results.

## **2. Standardized Questions Subcommittee**



Representing the subcommittee, Terri Marceron presented *Standardized Questions, Format for Research Team Presentations to the Task Force (Attachment B)* for Task Force review and discussion.

**Terri Marceron:** The subcommittee members wanted to make sure that everyone was on the same page by outlining the purpose of standardized format. We wanted to make sure that the questions would:

1. Provide a consistent basis for comparison for the Task Force/public in receiving/listening to individual research team presentations.
2. Ensure that researchers address/integrate Task Force questions into their presentation.
3. Ensure that research presentations focus on research findings, and what those findings mean and NOT values.
4. Ensure that researcher findings integrate with the Governor's executive order.
5. Address individualized research team presentations.

These questions are not designed for a final roundtable discussion. They are for the individualized scientific presentation. As it related to individualized presentation, we were fortunate that both Duncan and Chuck gave us some questions, and in addition we also added some questions. The subcommittee has come up with 12 questions. We felt that the questions needed to be done in a sequential manner and that each researcher address each question. We did not want to get into wordsmithing the questions. We're comfortable that they address what we're looking for. We didn't have a proposed number, but we felt there should be a manageable number. We thought the researchers should be able to give their whole presentation before we began asking questions. These are 12 questions that we think are valid, should we cut that list down to a more manageable number? We talked about the flexibility that the researchers could integrate them into their formal presentations at the beginning or after. We want to recognize that the panel discussion to take place at the end will require a different set of questions.

**Andy Dana:** I'd say #7 is not fair to the scientists. #9 also asks the scientists to do our work for us.

**Michelle Goodwine:** I don't know that #11 works, either. Are they aware of everything else, all the other studies being conducted?

**Duncan Patten:** Yes, they are aware. The researchers meet together and talk about what the others are doing. It really is just allowing them to begin to think about and present to this group how they perceive integration.

**Terri Marceron:** Did I hear someone say that #7 was a value question?

**Ellen Woodbury:** I think that's asking the researchers to do our job.

**Terri Marceron:** The reason we came up with that question is that, if you look at the executive order, we took the terms the order asked the Task Force to address.

**Ellen Woodbury:** Asked the Task Force to address, not the researchers.

**Terri Marceron:** That wasn't one that was purely scientific, you're right Ellen, it was just trying to get some discussion about what the governor asked us to do.

**Ellen Woodbury:** I guess I don't think the researchers should be interjecting their values into the research.

**Terri Marceron:** We're saying elements or factors, and you could potentially call beauty a value, but integrity and function from their perspective isn't necessarily a value question.

**Ellen Woodbury:** The job of this Task Force is to come up with recommendations, it isn't the job of the researchers. The researchers job is to present the information so that we can make those recommendations. I don't think we should be asking them questions like #7.

**John Bailey:** Can I see the number of people who'd like to keep question #7? I'm not seeing any hands.

**Question #7 was dropped by consensus.**

**Andy Dana:** My concern with #9 is that if you look at the list of issues, this could be a potentially huge time sink for a researcher to try to address. I think it should be fairly self-evident, but maybe I'm wrong.

**John Bailey:** Maybe we want to bring this back up after we go through the topics of consideration, which we will address next.

**Terri Marceron:** I'd also keep in mind that I don't think we were looking for a 20-minute discussion on how they impact.

**John Bailey:** Any other issues on any other questions?

**Jerry O'Hair:** How about #6? Is that a matter of conjecture or what?

**Andy Dana:** I found #6 odd, because it's odd to talk about natural stressors on the natural river processes. If they're natural, why are they stressors?

**Duncan Patten:** Floods and droughts can be stressors.

**Jerry O'Hair:** I think it's a matter of drawing a conclusion. It's a matter of conjecture as far as I'm concerned.

**Duncan Patten:** That question is basically asking what we asked them to show in their research.

**Allan Steinle:** From my standpoint #6 is the most important as far as the things we need to address in bank stabilization.

**Robert Ray:** I can also say that from the DEQ perspective this question has significant interest.

**Allan Steinle:** We are paying our researchers a lot of money to answer this specific question.

**Andy Dana:** I think that maybe one of the problems you're having is that it assumes that everyone has the same definition of natural river processes. Some people may have a different understanding of what that means. There's a distinction in here, natural or anthropogenic.

**Duncan Patten:** What you're basically saying is massive air pollution in the city is natural. Anything humans do is natural.

**Andy Dana:** That could be argued. I think that is the source of Jerry's discomfort. Is that right?

**Jerry O'Hair:** Yeah, it is. I don't care how much money we've spent, I've spent a lot of money on weather forecasts and most of the time it isn't worth a damn. I think this is a leading question.

**Duncan Patten:** What's in question #6 is exactly what we asked the researchers to do. You want to take out "natural river processes," "stressors on the river processes"? Just take out "natural" in the second line?

**Doug Ensign:** I think it's a good idea to drop the word "natural" in the second line.

**John Bailey:** Is everyone comfortable with taking "natural" out?

**Question #6 was modified by consensus.**

**Doug Ensing:** I'm not clear as to what question #2 means. I think I understand it, but I'm not sure.

**Duncan Patten:** My reason for question #2 is that there's been a lot of discussion about the role of fires. To think beyond the floodplain, think beyond the immediate river area and see if there are other conditions out there. It's asking the researchers to expand their thinking. If we want to cut questions, leave it out. Drop #2 and use #8 to be more specific.

**John Bailey:** Is everyone happy with dropping question #2?

**Question #2 was dropped by consensus.**

**Andy Dana:** Can I go to #3? I don't think it's good to ask yes or no questions. Can we say why or why not?

**Question #3 is modified by consensus.**

**Duncan Patten:** #5 is conjecture, trying to go back 300 years. Mike Merigliano might be able to do that with his trees.

**Terri Marceron:** I think Chuck Dalby felt he could go back. What we could do is leave the time frame in, but it would give the group the context to consider over time.

**Andy Dana:** We could say, "How have the resources you have studied in the Upper Yellowstone River changed historically?"

**Allan Steinle:** Or could we say, "within the temporal scope of your study."

**Andy Dana:** At least limit it by making them talk about the resources they studied initially. "How have the resources you've studied in the Upper Yellowstone River changed within the temporal scope of your study?"

**John Bailey:** Are people comfortable with that?

**Duncan Patten:** I think we're encouraging them to think more long term than that.

**Tom Olliff:** What about, "How have the resources in your study changed over the last 50 to 300 years?" Some will and some won't be able to say anything.

**Allan Steinle:** I like the overall question, and how we divide it is not going to be too important.

**John Bailey:** Are people comfortable with that?

**Question #5 was modified by consensus.**

**Duncan Patten:** #12. We don't want to address conclusions. You could say, "Did you address hypothesis beyond those that were originally in your work order?" I would like to drop it.

**Andy Dana:** I'd be more interested in hearing what questions were raised by your research.

**John Bailey:** The last I heard was, "What other questions were raised by your research?" Is that correct? Are people comfortable with that?

**Question #12 was modified by consensus.**

**Duncan Patten:** #10 could be dropped. What do you mean by "unanticipated results"? All results are unanticipated. We're addressing that with the rewording of #12.

**Question #10 was dropped by consensus.**

**John Bailey:** Have we addressed all of the troublesome questions and accept the edits, except for #9? We will hold off on #9 for a few more minutes until we address topics of consideration.

Now we have to determine how we plan to ask these questions. Is the chair going to ask them, or are they going to be integrated into the study presentation?

**Andy Dana:** I think we'd save ourselves a lot of time if the Task Force submits them ahead of time and the researchers come with written answers. If we have questions about the written responses, then we can ask them orally.

**John Bailey:** We've got public that will then be left out. If they walk in here they would be totally lost.

**Liz Galli-Noble:** I would like to ask one other question of Duncan. We're asking for a preliminary report from the researchers one week in advance of the presentation, and if we also want written responses to these questions, do you think they will have the time to do all this?

I think we're pushing our luck a little bit at the beginning. Realistically, I don't think we're going to get it for the first three presentations.

As for public access to information, I could request that information to be given to us electronically and it could be posted on the Task Force website.

**Duncan Patten:** If you ask for written responses, I would request that you ask them to give brief responses. If you ask them these questions in a public session, one question at a time, you're looking at one to two hours of discussion, depending on whom you're asking. These are oral exam type questions. Maybe they could integrate them into their talk and address them during the presentation.

**Liz Galli-Noble:** If we want written responses in advance, we might not get it from the hydrology and geomorphology studies. We're pushing them to get this done so quickly that we should be open to allowing the first couple presenters to address the questions verbally. Everything that comes in from January on, will be no issue with written responses and posting them on the website. If that is the path you choose to go.

**John Bailey:** Is it fair to look at the answers before we've heard the research? I think it's unfair to read answers before you've heard the study, and I know people will do that.

**Andy Dana:** Instead of having a formal questions and answers submitted before the presentation, we could provide all the researchers these questions in advance, and ask them to address them to the extent possible during their oral presentation.

**Liz Galli-Noble:** I think that's an excellent suggestion.

**Andy Dana:** We can post these questions for the public on the website.

**John Bailey:** Are people comfortable with this? In summary: the chair will not be asking the questions; we have eliminated questions #2, #7, #10, and have changed #3, #5, #6, and #12; and #9 regarding the topics of consideration is pending, which we can address right now.

**3. Topics of Consideration Subcommittee (Issues, and Competing Values and Uses)**

Representing the subcommittee, Ellen Woodbury presented *Issues List, "Topics of Consideration"* (Attachment C) for Task Force review and discussion.

**Ellen Woodbury:** We went through the original 1997 list of issues and cut out a lot of informational things and non-issues. I think we left out fisheries, and we need to add it. This is just a basic list for discussion.

**John Bailey:** Are we limited to these?

**Michelle Goodwine:** No. We took the original list that the Task Force brainstormed in 1997, and out of that list we asked ourselves, “Is that something we could make a recommendation on?” and took out the ones that we couldn’t.

**John Bailey:** Would you consider adding to this list?

**Ellen Woodbury:** Yes. The purpose of this list is to have something to make recommendations on. Right now we have nothing. We have studies, but we need something to relate those studies to. What are these studies telling us about the issues that are important to us?

**John Bailey:** Any discussion on this list?

**Andy Dana:** I guess I don’t understand the GIS information item.

**Ellen Woodbury:** There will be a fair amount of GIS information that comes along with this, but we may want more. That is what we meant by GIS Information.

**Allan Steinle:** If it were stored in a public source, then it would be available to Task Force members.

**Andy Dana:** How about the item: use of river and locations; locations meaning locations of use?

**Michelle Goodwine:** Yes. We didn’t change the wording from the original list. We didn’t try and rethink what was originally meant. We just asked, could this be something we could make a recommendation on?

**Ellen Woodbury:** I would think that would mean everything from river floaters to irrigation and how they’re integrated.

**John Bailey:** If things aren’t in the studies, I don’t know if we’ll be able to deal with them for recommendations.

**Rodney Schwartz:** There are several studies that are not addressed here. I think this should be viewed as a starting point, but viewed in light of the actual studies the Task Force decided to do.

**John Bailey:** I think the concept is that the topics of consideration are fluid.

**Andy Dana:** I think it’s a good start.

**Jim Woodhull:** It helps us to be thinking about topics.

**Andy Dana:** Could we add “fisheries”, and clarify by adding “uses of river” and “locations of use”, and then maybe #6 by saying “floodplain uses”? Floodplain uses would encompass many studies.

**Robert Ray:** #9 should be “healthy” as opposed to “health”.

**John Bailey:** Anyone uncomfortable with this list being fluid?

**By consensus the Topics of Consideration is endorsed as a fluid list.**

**CONTINUED: 1. Task Force Presentation Process**

Discussion returned to the previously addressed *Task Force Presentation Process (Attachment A)*. The Task Force asked Liz to review the edits made to the presentation process earlier that evening, specifically the edits made to #3 the Questions Session.

**Liz Galli-Noble:** 3a was deleted given the decision to incorporate the standardized questions into the presentations.

**Michelle Goodwine:** Why not drop 3 altogether?

**Liz Galli-Noble:** There is a distinction between asking the researcher a question for clarification, and bringing up values, concerns, and issues that cannot be addressed by the researchers. That was why they split out the questions session from the general discussion portion. You might feel they are the same; that's fine.

**Michelle Goodwine:** I was wondering why we put 3b under 2a.

**Liz Galli-Noble:** What I wrote down is: the first edit to #2 read, "asking questions about factual or methodological type questions". For #3b (like it already read in #4) we decided that the Task Force members would ask questions first, then the public would be given a chance. We then retained 3c stating that the Task Force chair asks, "Is everyone prepared to move on?"

**Michelle Goodwine:** And the public is going to get a copy of this presentation process?

**Liz Galli-Noble:** Yes.

**Andy Dana:** Can we limit the question sessions to whether the researchers addressed the eight questions?

**Michelle Goodwine:** So then clarify 3, instead of it just saying "question session", clarify the type. It looks like we have it twice.

**Terri Marceron:** You just have to say standardized questions.

**John Bailey:** Someone gets up in the public and asks a question, how do you determine if it's of the standardized questions or not?

**Andy Dana:** I don't have any problem dropping the questions session.

**Liz Galli-Noble:** So you would say that the presentation is the same as the question session?

**Michelle Goodwine:** No, if you go up to 2, it says that the questions are held until the end of the presentation, unless they're brief and if we've already moved 3b to 2a, we addressed that already.

**Liz Galli-Noble:** When the presentation is made, you're not supposed to interrupt. You're allowed to if you ask a very specific question that's just trying to clarify the point that's being made. When the presentation is done, then there's a questions session.

**John Bailey:** They only get to ask a question if I recognize it.

**Liz Galli-Noble:** Are we saying that we don't want questions in #2; you only want questions in a question session? If you really want to have an hour presentation, the researchers need to be given uninterrupted time, or it will take three hours to get through the presentation.

**Tom Olliff:** Maybe we should just say, questions are held until end of presentation.

**Michelle Goodwine:** I need you to read what 2a says, and what the changes are.

**Liz Galli-Noble:** It was my understanding there was no agreed upon 2a. How it ended up was, there would only be brief factual questions allowed under 2.

**Tom Olliff:** I suggested that questions be held until the end of the presentation.

**John Bailey:** No questions until the end of presentation, period.

**Liz Galli-Noble:** Under #3 may we keep in “no comments or concerns at this time”, that’s the distinction between questions and issues. People will start talking about values, and we could get bogged down in that and never finish the question session.

**Tom Olliff:** I think you have to move it along as fast as you can, and there may be some people who don’t get their questions answered. Also, you can’t stop people from bring up issues during the questions session.

**Liz Galli-Noble:** I have to disagree, because you can tell them simply, “that it’s not a question, it’s an issue, and they can hold it until the discussion period”. You just have to be strict about it.

**Tom Olliff:** I don’t disagree; I think the chair has to do it.

**John Bailey:** I think it needs to say “questions of the research”, that way I have grounds to say what I need to.

**Andy Dana:** You can add “questions of the research”, and then move to “Task Force members speak first and if they have no further questions, they move to the public”.

**John Bailey:** Now we’re going back to standard questions #9. That’s the topics list that we just approved. Is that too open-ended? If they do this, will it take too long? Does anyone want to strike #9?

**Ellen Woodbury:** Yes.

**Question #9 is deleted by consensus.**

#### **4. Additional Decision-Making Processes to be Discussed**

John Bailey reminded the group that they tabled the recommendation process discussion at the July Task Force meeting, with the plan to address it at a future Task Force meeting. The Task Force then reviewed a *Possible Process for Recommendation Development* handout (*Attachment D*). This discussion followed:

**Liz Galli-Noble:** After the July Task Force meeting, I heard positive feedback about this list of possible outcomes for proposed recommendations. If we move into this new recommendation development discussion tonight, we may want to look at this list of possible outcomes or we may want to go in a different direction.

**Terri Marceron:** Where does the roundtable come in? We will need a process specifically for the roundtable/panel discussion.

**John Bailey:** Does anyone want to talk about additional processes tonight? I’m not trying to avoid it. Do we want to go through a couple?

**Karin Boyd:** I was involved in a similar process. What we found is that some of the best recommendations were brainstormed, and they were mission statements. We didn’t call them draft recommendations, we called them proposed recommendations. In the process it became a lot easier to shoot things down than to generate new ones. Some of the things

that made it were the most off the wall to begin with. We encouraged flexible documentation of this list. It really was surprising in terms of what made it through the process.

**Roy Aserlind:** Did you require that recommendations came through in writing?

**Karin Boyd:** They were done orally, but then the group members were allowed to submit them in spreadsheet form.

Note: Karin provided the following additional information after this meeting:

The group that I worked with found the following to be helpful in the process:

- a. A "no holds barred" approach to suggestions early on. All suggestions were compiled and the lists grew and overlapped through time.
- b. A requirement that any suggestion consist of the identification of a **Problem**, the **Impact of that Problem** with respect to the issue of concern (for example, cutthroats), and a **Potential Solution**. This prevented baseless recommendations, required a level of scientific understanding, and promoted cause-and-effect discussions.
- c. An allowance for submittal of ideas by email, such that the recommendations were not attributed to any one individual. Everyone was sent a blank spreadsheet, and they were easy to compile.
- d. Once the compilation was complete, it was pretty efficient to march straight through the lists. The recommendations became much more refined in the process, as they started out pretty general. Also, nobody was blindsided by surprises late in the process. The most brazen ideas had time to ferment.

**Andy Dana:** We just get a pool of proposed recommendations, and once the reports are done, we go to town on them.

**John Bailey:** Our approved process says, "issues, comments, and concerns will be recorded". I guess we'll put them in the minutes.

**Duncan Patten:** While people are bringing them up, I suggest you put them on flipcharts to put on the wall.

**Andy Dana:** Use our topics of consideration list as the beginning of an outline.

**Ellen Woodbury:** That would give you more topics.

**John Bailey:** I hate to have Liz have to determine which one they go under. I don't think a non-Task Force member should have to do that.

**Rodney Schwartz:** Are you thinking about having a running list of the brainstorming, and then submit draft recommendations in spreadsheet form? Then the Task Force will have a running list.

**John Bailey:** We'd put them in a notebook, and keep adding them in categories based on the science. When all the research comes in, we can bring it together.

**Liz Galli-Noble:** If you look at #s 1 and 2, eliminate the word "recommendation" and add "issues", you may have the method you want. We keep putting this discussion off, but I don't know when we'll do it if we don't do it now. I don't mind helping to record and then cleaning up the records for Task Force review. I think that we will be able to take much of this from the minutes. We can also use the flip charts as back ups. I'm happy to put the list together.

**John Bailey:** I told Liz that we'll have to capture the ideas brought up at these meetings. People should be able to flip back and see what issues we talked about. Whatever we start with is going to change.

**Liz Galli-Noble:** If we use flipcharts and a note taker, the next day I could type them up. I think a notebook for each Task Force members is a great idea, that way you will have all the comments on record, in front of you as you go through the process. I'm happy to do all of that. The only risk is that I shouldn't be the one interpreting what was said, so I would like a checks-and-balances established; I could run my write-ups by the Task Force members for edit.



**John Bailey:** I would like to move on to TAC issues.

## **V. TAC Issues**

### **Format for Reports and Presentations**

**Liz Galli-Noble:** We have never formally decided on a format for research reports and presentations. We have talked about it, but have never come to any final decision. I asked Duncan to address this tonight.

**Duncan Patten:** I'm not going to spend a lot of time on this because we hope that the presentations and reports are done in a standard scientific fashion. Here's the introduction, here's the hypothesis, here's our methods, these are our results, and these are our conclusions. Hopefully the oral can be a little more freewheeling. It's pretty straightforward. The presentations may have to go away from the results a bit. There are no surprises about how this will be presented. The reports will be written up in standard scientific fashion.

## **VI. Outreach and Education Activities Update**

Liz Galli-Noble reported the following outreach and education activities:

1. John Bailey took Christi Todd Whitman, EPA Administrator, fishing on August 7, 2002. She was the keynote speaker for the Fly Fishing Federation dinner that same night.
2. John Bailey and Liz did a one-hour presentation to the FFF on August 10, 2002.
3. John Bailey and Liz participated in the Park City Utah Summer Tour; they did presentations and Liz gave a short tour of the river.
4. The 2<sup>nd</sup> Socio-Economic public meeting will be held on Wednesday, September 18, 2002 at the Yellowstone Inn. Everyone is encouraged to attend.
5. Liz will try and get educational packages on permits and the SAMP process out to Task Force members within 30 days. Montana's conservation districts put out a great informational package on similar issues, which Liz will also provide to the Task Force members.

## **VII. Schedule Next Task Force Meetings**

The next Task Force meetings are scheduled for:

**Wednesday, September 18, 2002**—Socio-Economic public meeting, at 7:00 pm

Location: Yellowstone Inn

**Thursday, September 19, 2002**—Presentation #1. *Watershed Land Use Assessment*, at 7:00 pm

Location: Yellowstone Inn

**Monday, October 7, 2002**—Regular Task Force meeting, 7:00 pm

Location: Yellowstone Inn

**Tuesday, November 5, 2002**—Presentation #2. *Socio-Economic Assessment*, at 7:00 pm

Location: City/County Courthouse, Community Room (basement)

**Tuesday, November 19, 2002**—Presentation #3. Hydraulic Analysis, 7:00 pm

Location: City/County Courthouse, Community Room (basement)

**Thursday, December 12, 2002**—Presentation #4. Geomorphology Study, 7:00 pm

Location: Yellowstone Inn

## **VIII. The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 pm.**

## **Attachment A. Task Force ~~Consensus Decision-Making~~ Presentation Process**

The following edits were made by the Task Force at the August 20, 2002 meeting, or following that meeting. This process will be used at all research study presentations from September 2002 to April 2003.

### **PROCESS STEPS**

#### **Preparation for Study Presentation**

A written draft final report will be submitted to Task Force members and posted on Task Force website one week in advance of each research formal presentation.

#### **Formal Study Presentation to Task Force**

##### **Introduction**

(A) Task Force Chair: Reminder of presentation format and full decision-making process.

(B) TAC Chair Introduction of Research Team

TAC Chair: Introduction of research team, study background, and address how this individual study fits within the comprehensive/integrated project design.

##### **2. Presentation of Research Methods, Findings, Interpretations, and Conclusions**

Questions held until end of presentation ~~unless they are brief, clarification type questions.~~

##### **3. Questions Session**

~~Task Force Chair asks research team set of "standardized questions".~~

a. ***Task Force members speak first and when they have no further questions, members of the public will be asked for their questions.***

b. ~~Additional questions are strictly limited to seek greater comprehension; no comments or concerns at this time; By polling the group, the Task Force Chair makes sure that everyone fully comprehends information presented~~ ***has had an opportunity to ask questions and that the group is ready to move on to the discussion session.***

##### **4. General Discussion Session**

Task Force Chair opens the floor to a broad, open discussion. ***Issues, comments, and concerns are raised and recorded.***

a. ~~Issues, comments, and concerns are raised and recorded.~~

a. Task Force members speak first, and when they have no further comments, members of the public will be asked for their input/comments.

b. The Task Force will determine if there is a need for more information from the research team, or if there are additional questions/issues for the TAC.

c. ~~If any "draft" recommendations surface at this point, they will be clearly documented. When applicable, these "draft" recommendations will be revisited by the Task Force, at which point they may be rejected, modified, or endorsed as "final" recommendations.~~

c. ***If Task Force members propose recommendations, they will be clearly documented and recorded. At the Task Force's discretion, proposed recommendations may be discussed immediately or deferred for later consideration. Any decision on proposed recommendations, including deferral of consideration, endorsement, modification, or rejection, shall be made in accordance with the consensus process adopted by the Task Force.***

d. ***Task Force members and members of the public may submit additional written comments and concerns via the Coordinator—outside of Task Force meetings. Those comments will be shared with Task Force members and recorded.***

NOTE: The Task Force-approved *TAC Protocol* (see attachment) will be strictly adhered to during this and future stages of this process.

**Attachment B. STANDARDIZED QUESTIONS**  
**FORMAT FOR RESEARCH TEAM PRESENTATIONS TO THE TASK FORCE**  
July 25, 2002

The following set of questions was compiled by a specially appointed committee to the Task Force. Members of that group include: Roy Aserlind, Doug Ensign, Terri Marceron, and Jim Woodhull. Additional questions were also suggested by Duncan Patten and Chuck Dalby.

**EXISTING SIDEBOARDS:**

1. Follow Task Force-approved October 2001 TAC Protocol

**PURPOSE OF STANDARDIZED FORMAT (QUESTIONS):**

1. Provide a consistent basis for comparison for the Task Force/public in receiving/listening to individual research team presentations.
2. Ensure that researchers address/integrate Task Force questions into their presentation.
3. Ensure that research presentations focus on research findings, and what those findings mean and NOT values.
4. Ensure that researcher findings integrate with the Governor's Executive Order establishing the Task Force.
5. Address individualized research team presentations (recognizing that the final closeout panel will have a different set of questions linking all studies together).

**POTENTIAL QUESTIONS:**

**IN RELATIONSHIP TO YOUR STUDY....**

*Note: Edits made to the original text by the Task Force at the August 20, 2002 meeting are shown below:*

1. Recognizing ~~limitations to your study by~~ your study's budget and time **constraints**, how comprehensive are your data relative to the Task Force study area of the Yellowstone River?
2. ~~How might your data and interpretation of that data have been influenced by conditions found within the watershed during your study period, in comparison to other potential climatic and environmental conditions?~~
3. Have you found significant differences in your results relative to different geomorphic sub-reaches of the Task Force study area of the Yellowstone River? **Why? Why not?**
4. How important ~~do you see~~ **is** the connectivity between the floodplain and river in the interpretation of your data?
5. How have **the resources you studied in** the Upper Yellowstone River changed over the last 50-300 years?
6. Are there any particular river conditions—natural or anthropogenic—that your results ~~appear to~~ indicate are important stressors on the ~~natural~~ river processes that you studied?
7. ~~Within the scope of your study what elements or factors constitute the “integrity,” “beauty,” and “function” of the river? What comprehensive actions are needed to ensure that these remain intact? Having identified these factors, how could you balance the needs of the community and landowners to protect property?~~

8. Recognizing the short-term nature of your study, do you think that the condition of Upper Yellowstone River Watershed—for example, its vegetation cover, *recent drought*, altering events such as fires, timber cutting, grazing, and residential development—have influenced your research results, relative to the river processes you studied?

~~9. Explain how your study directly impacts, or is impacted by, the Task Force list of issues, and competing values and uses? (List to be determined at 8/20/02 Task Force meeting.)~~

~~10. Did your study produce any unanticipated results that add to the useful scientific knowledge of the Task Force?~~

11. What portion of your results do you see integrating with results of other Task Force studies?

12. What other questions and conclusions did you address *were raised by your research?*

#### **FOLLOW UP ISSUES FOR THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS:**

**1. Should this list be cut down to a more manageable number (say 6 questions)? Before presenting to TF, or by the full TF?**

**2. Can these questions be worked into the formal presentation format? Should they come after the formal presentation?**

**Attachment C. Issues List  
“Topics of Consideration”**

**August 16, 2002**

- 1. Bank Stabilization**
- 2. GIS Information**
- 3. Roads and Crossings**
- 4. Woody Debris – What to do with it.**
- 5. Uses of River and Locations**
- 6. Floodplain**
- 7. Sedimentation and Dredging**
- 8. Permitting**
- 9. Indicators of a Health River –Can we define health?**
- 10. Fires**
- 11. Plan Development**

---

This list was developed by a special Task Force subcommittee: Michelle Goodwine, Ellen Woodbury, and Bob Wiltshire. It is based on an original December 9, 1997 Task Force Brainstorming Session, where the Task Force brainstormed a lengthy list of topics in response to two general questions:

What are the issues that the Task Force should consider?

What does the Task Force want to do?

The topics and issues listed were then grouped into six general categories, as follows:

**1. Inventory**

Two categories:

- (a) What we know, compiled from currently available data.
- (b) What we need to find out; information that is not readily available.

Describe the setting:           How did the Task Force get here?

Where is the Task Force headed?

Fish data available

Stabilized banks

Basic flow of river

Stages

GIS information

Grazing and land use practices

Role of fires

Woody debris

Chemistry

Need Park Service and Forest Service participation

Roads

TMDL

Crossings

Roles and interactions of tributaries

Uses of river and locations

Survey—topographic

Groundwater—losing and gaining

Geology

Water quality and testing

Hydrology

Flood plain

Watershed hydrology

Gravel: where does it come from? Where does it go?

Sedimentatio

## **2. Training & Educational Needs**

### **(for the Task Force, public, landowners, and governmental agencies)**

Permitting. Is there a conditional permitting process? Flexibility and consistency

Educate ourselves about the results of our inventory

Case histories/legal rights

What have the floods meant for the river?

Role of fires

Role and place of bank stabilization

What is wild and free flowing?

Chemistry, physics, biology of river

Definitions

History

Economic values

Watershed hydrology

Understanding unique character of the Yellowstone River

Floodplain importance and 100-year flood

Gravel: what do we do about it? When are gravels essential to a healthy river? When are they not? What is equilibrium?

Cottonwood and willow regeneration

Dredging

## **3. Health of the River: Biological and Economic**

What is being done now?

What is a healthy river? For example: describe the river, muddy ... is this healthy?

What effects have barbs and other actions had on the river?

Pre- and post-flood fishery status

Continued development of the floodplain

Who "call" the river healthy?

Can we define health? When? Why? Healthy for whom?

What are indicators of health?

Scenic values

Role of fires

## **4. Plan Development**

Develop a comprehensive plan

Develop a plan that adapts to changing circumstances

Conditional Corps permit—for example, one process?

For a healthy river

Water quality—targeting restoration efforts

Compliance—monitoring

## **5. Social Perceptions / Roles**

Loss of private property

Harmony between growth and a wild river

Concessions to keep the river wild and flowing

Economic value

Technical and financial assistance for studies and actions (bank stabilization)

Facilitate a "meeting of minds" regarding the river and potential and /or real actions on it

Role of society in helping facilitate sound decision-making

Who will provide the floodplain?

Continue to live along the river

Continued development of floodplain

Encouraging a comprehensive approach—articulate and implement  
Legal rights

**6. Implementation**

Compliance  
Monitoring  
Enforcement

**Attachment D. Possible Process for Recommendation Development**  
**August 20, 2002**

When recommendations are formally made the following process will be used:

**Process Steps:**

1. All recommendations must be clearly stated and recorded/listed.
2. The group identifies patterns and related recommendations.
3. The Task Force Chair restates each recommendation made and asks the Task Force for final concerns and questions relating to each recommendation.
4. The Task Force Chair calls for consensus on each recommendation made.
5. The Task Force formally adopts recommendations that achieve consensus.
6. If any recommendations fail to achieve consensus, return to those recommendations and continue discussion, and again call for consensus (as outlined above).

**Note:** If time permits, a small group of Task Force members (in particular those attributed to the specific unresolved recommendation issues) can be asked to meet to reevaluate the recommendation and then return to the full Task Force to report and have further discussion.

**Possible Outcomes for Proposed Recommendations**

1. Adoption of Recommendation—the full Task Force formally adopts the recommendation and details will be outlined in a final report to the Governor.
2. Stand Aside—the Task Force member is willing to stand aside; the member acknowledges that their concern with the recommendation still exists, but they are willing to allow the recommendation to be adopted. The recommendation and details will be outlined in a final report to the Governor.
3. Declare Block—the Task Force Chair declares that consensus cannot be reached on that recommendation and the group will simply move on.